arXiv:1402.3077v3 [cond-mat.supr-con] 12 Jun 2014

Inhomogeneous slowing down of spin fluctuations induced by charge stripe order in 1/8-doped lanthanum cuprates

S.-H. Baek,[1,*] M. Hücker,[2] A. Erb,[3] G. D. Gu,[2] B. Büchner,[1,4] and H.-J. Grafe[1]

[1] *IFW-Dresden, Institute for Solid State Research, PF 270116, 01171 Dresden, Germany*
[2] *Condensed Matter Physics and Materials Science Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*
[3] *Walther-Meißner-Institut, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Walther-Meißner-Straße 8, D-85748 Garching, Germany*
[4] *Institut für Festkörperphysik, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: June 13, 2014)

We report ^{139}La nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements on $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ ($0.07 \leq x \leq 0.15$) and $La_{2-x}Ba_xCuO_4$ ($x = 1/8$) single crystals, focusing on the spin freezing observed in 1/8-doped lanthanum cuprates. Charge stripe order seems to induce the inhomogeneous slowing down of spin fluctuations toward spin order and compete with superconductivity.

Static charge and spin stripe order is a universal characteristic in the lanthanum cuprates such as $La_{2-x}Ba_xCuO_4$ and $La_{2-x-y}M_ySr_xCuO_4$ (M=Nd,Eu) near a hole concentration of $x = 1/8$, hereafter called 1/8 anomaly.[1–4] While static charge stripe order has not been observed in superconducting (SC) $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$, a strong tendency near $x = 1/8$ has been implicated.[5,6] Recently, the almost static nature of charge order was proven by soft x-ray diffraction measurements,[7] which detected static charge order at $T_{CO}^{surf} = 55$ K pinned by small perturbations near the surface of LSCO:0.12 single crystal, but not in the bulk of the sample. Such a charge ordering tendency and its interplay with superconductivity seems to cause a variety of unusual features, such as an inhomogeneous SC state[8,9] and significant effects of magnetic field on static antiferromagnetic (AFM) correlations coexisting with superconductivity.[10–16]

Along with these observations, a spin-freezing behavior is a common feature observed in lightly-doped cuprates.[17–23] While the glassy spin order is rapidly suppressed by increasing doping, it is peculiarly enhanced near 1/8-doping,[14,24] involving the strong enhancement of the NMR spin-lattice relaxation rate, T_1^{-1}.[25–28] This unusual reappearance of spin order in nearly 1/8-doped LSCO is possibly attributed to the localized carriers due to charge ordering[5]. This paper presents ^{139}La T_1^{-1} measurements in stripe-ordered LBCO:1/8 as well as superconducting LSCO:1/8. The temperature and field dependences of T_1^{-1} suggest that the onset of inhomogeneous slowing down of spin fluctuations (SFs) toward spin order could be the fingerprint for charge stripe order.

The $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ and $La_{2-x}Ba_xCuO_4$ were grown with the traveling solvent floating zone method, as described in Refs. 29 and 30, respectively.

^{139}La NMR measurements were performed on $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ single crystals with $x = 0.07$, 0.1, 0.125, and 0.15, and $La_{2-x}Ba_xCuO_4$ single crystal with $x = 0.125$, in an external field H that ranges from 6 to 16 T, applied along the crystallographic c axis. ^{139}La ($I = 7/2$) spin-lattice relaxation rates T_1^{-1} were measured at the central transition ($+1/2 \leftrightarrow -1/2$) by monitoring the recovery of magnetization after saturation with a single $\pi/2$ pulse. Then the relaxation data were fitted to the following formula:

$$1 - \frac{M(t)}{M(\infty)} = a\left(\frac{1}{84}e^{-(t/T_1)^\beta} + \frac{3}{44}e^{-(6t/T_1)^\beta} + \frac{75}{364}e^{-(15t/T_1)^\beta} + \frac{1225}{1716}e^{-(28t/T_1)^\beta}\right), \quad (1)$$

where M the nuclear magnetization and a a fitting parameter that is ideally one. β is the stretching exponent, which is less than unity when T_1^{-1} becomes spatially distributed due to inhomogeneous spin freezing. In Fig. 1(**d**), the typical recovery of M versus t and its fit to Eq. (1) are presented for three chosen temperatures measured at 10.7 T for LSCO:1/8.

Figure 1 (**a**) shows *in situ* ac susceptibility measured in the NMR tank circuit in zero external field for three compositions of $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$. Here we identify T_c from the onset of the drop (vertical dotted lines), and the resultant values are found to be in agreement with SQUID measurements. The SC transitions of the crystals are generally quite sharp, supporting the high quality. Nevertheless, we find that the transition for $x = 1/8$ is clearly broader than for the two neighboring dopings $x = 0.1$ and 0.15. Similar additional broadening of the SC transition near 1/8-doping was previously observed,[31] but its origin has rarely been discussed. *A priori*, the pronounced broadening in LSCO:1/8 may be related to the suppression of T_c due to the strong tendency toward stripe order. Namely, the local pinning by the lattice of otherwise slowly fluctuating stripe order may cause inhomogeneously distributed T_c. Indeed, this pinning effect by the lattice accounts for the large reduction of T_c observed in nearly 1/8-doped but disordered LSCO.[10,27,32]

Figure 1 (**b**) shows the temperature and doping dependence of ^{139}La T_1^{-1} measured at 10.7 T on a semi-log scale. For $x = 0.07$, T_1^{-1} is enhanced at low T by more than two decades, representing the rapid slowing down of SFs toward glassy spin order.[29] As x is increased, this strong T_1^{-1} enhancement is greatly suppressed by more



FIG. 1: (**a**) *In situ* ac susceptibility versus T at three dopings measured in the NMR circuit in zero field. The SC transition is notably broader at $x = 1/8$. (**b**) ^{139}La T_1^{-1} versus T as a function of x measured at 10.7 T. The strong enhancement of T_1^{-1} at $x = 0.07$ is drastically suppressed with increasing x, yielding to the T-linear metallic behavior of T_1^{-1} (denoted by dashed curve) at nearly optimal $x = 0.15$. In stark contrast, doping $x = 1/8$ causes a strong upturn of T_1^{-1}, which is emphasized on a linear scale in the inset, deviating from the T-linear behavior at $\sim$ 70 K (up arrow). (**c**) Stretching exponent β versus T in LSCO:1/8. The deviation of β from one occurs near 70 K. (**d**) Recovery of the normalized nuclear magnetization M as a function of time t on a semi-log plot at three chosen temperatures. The time axis has the same color code as the data. Solid curves are the fits to the data using Eq. (1), yielding T_1 and β. To compare the effect of non-unity β on the recovery of M, the maximum of the time axis range for each temperature was set to $10T_1$.

than an order of magnitude at $x = 0.1$ and disappears completely at nearly optimal doping $x = 0.15$.[47]

Remarkably, 1/8-doping induces an unusual rapid upturn of T_1^{-1}, which is consistent with the enhanced glassy spin order detected in LSCO:0.12 by muon spin rotation (μSR)[14,24] and NMR.[25–27] Deviating at $\sim$ 70 K with respect to the linear T dependence which may be expected to be followed in this doping regime, T_1^{-1} rises sharply until it bends over at $\sim$ 18 K. Instead of forming a sharp local maximum expected in a conventional spin-glass phase, however, T_1^{-1} continues to increase before it drops abruptly at $\sim$ 8 K. The stretching exponent β from Eq. (1) also starts to deviate from unity near 70 K, as shown in Fig. 1(**c**). A β value less than unity indicates a spatial distribution of T_1^{-1} and, therefore, can be used as a measure for magnetic inhomogeneity of the spin system. Thus our T_1^{-1} shows that SFs are inhomogeneously slowed down below $\sim$ 70 K.

At near 1/8-doping, the doped holes are expected to be largely delocalized,[33] yielding the metallic behavior as was confirmed for $x = 0.15$. In this case, since quenched disorder is shown not to be responsible for the glassy behavior in LSCO:1/8,[27] the entity that drives the unusual spin freezing near 1/8-doping is likely related to the 1/8-anomaly. Specifically, together with the unusual broadening of the SC transition shown in Fig. 1(**a**), we conjecture that charge stripe order, although it may be still rapidly fluctuating on the NMR time scale ($\sim \mu$s), may generate the randomness (e.g., localized holes) that could inhomogeneously slow down the spin fluctuations.

In order to check whether the inhomogeneous slowing down and charge order are related, we performed similar measurements in stripe-ordered LBCO:1/8, which are presented in Fig. 2 (**a**). The T_1^{-1} peak reveals a



FIG. 2: (**a**) ^{139}La T_1^{-1} (**b**) β versus T as a function of external field H in LBCO:1/8. Both T_1^{-1} and β show the abrupt change at near T_{CO}. With decreasing T, the sharp T_1^{-1} peak centered at $\sim$ 42 K is followed by broad peak just below T_{SO}. At the same time, β reaches a constant below T_{SO}, essentially independent of H. (**c**) ^{139}La T_1^{-1} (**d**) β versus T as a function of H in LSCO:1/8. In contrast to LBCO:1/8, T_1^{-1} shows a strong field dependence. In particular, the T_1^{-1} upturn is suppressed with decreasing H, i.e., with increasing T_c which is denoted by the up arrows. In the normal state, $\beta(T)$ is almost independent of H, as in LBCO:1/8.

strongly asymmetric peak whose height depends on the external field (i.e., the resonance frequency $\omega_n = \gamma_n H$ where γ_n is the nuclear gyromagnetic ratio). The field dependence of T_1^{-1} clearly shows that the high temperature side of the peak is frequency-independent. This low temperature frequency dependence of the T_1^{-1} peak is qualitatively understood by the Bloembergen, Purcell, and Pound (BPP) model[34] which is appropriate for describing the continuous slowing down of SFs,[26,35,36]

$$T_1^{-1} = \langle \gamma_n^2 h_\perp^2 \rangle \frac{\tau_c}{1+\omega_n^2 \tau_c^2}, \qquad (2)$$

where $h_\perp$ the local field fluctuating at the nuclear site, and the electron correlation time τ_c is in general given by $\tau_c = \tau_\infty \exp(E_a/T)$ with E_a the activation energy.

The BPP model predicts that the high temperature side of the T_1^{-1} peak is frequency independent, while the peak height decreases with increasing field. This is consistent with the main features of the T_1^{-1} peak in Fig. 2 (**a**). The similar BPP behavior is also observed in another stripe-ordered LESCO:0.13.[28] Most importantly, both T_1^{-1} and β manifest a very sharp anomaly just above T_{CO}, indicating that charge stripe order[37] triggers the inhomogeneous slowing down. Another surprise is that *below the spin ordering temperature* T_{SO},[37] T_1^{-1} falls off much slower than above T_{SO}. At the same time, β is almost saturated to a constant regardless of the external field strength, which could be interpreted to reflect stabilized spin order.

Returning to LSCO:1/8, the fact that the onset of both the T_1^{-1} enhancement and the deviation of β from unity is much less clear than LBCO:1/8 could reflect the rapidly fluctuating or significantly disordered nature of charge order in LSCO:1/8. Nevertheless, the onset temperature could be identified with reasonable certainty, suggesting that charge order seemingly occurs at $T_{CO} = 70(10)$ K, which appears to be independent of a magnetic field, as would be expected for charge stripe order above T_c.[38–41] At low temperatures, on the other hand, when supercon-

ductivity is nearly quenched at 16 T, the temperature dependence of β is very similar to that of LBCO:1/8, as shown in Fig. 2(**d**). In particular, it becomes almost a constant just below a sharp anomaly at 20 K. The similar T-dependence of β in the two materials suggests that $T_{\rm SO}$ in LSCO:1/8 as well as in LBCO:1/8 represents a true phase transition, rather than a progressive crossover, to spin order, despite the strong glassy character.

Taking it for granted that the inhomogeneous slowing down of SFs for 1/8-doped La cuprates is induced by charge ordering, NMR might further probe the interplay between stripe order and superconductivity in LSCO:1/8, which is a much better superconductor than its Ba doped relative. In fact, as shown in Fig. 2(**c**) and (**d**), the field dependence of T_1^{-1} appears to reveal such an interplay. At high fields (≥ 13 T), i.e. when superconductivity is sufficiently suppressed, the high temperature side of the T_1^{-1} peak is independent of H, which is similar to LBCO:1/8 and conform with the standard BPP model. However, the T_1^{-1} upturn clearly becomes suppressed with decreasing field, i.e. increasing T_c. This breakdown of the BPP behavior is indicative of a competition between charge order and superconductivity. An obvious question is then why the reduction of the T_1^{-1} upturn in Fig. 2(**c**) occurs well above the bulk $T_c(H)$. We think that this behavior is consistent with two-dimensional (2D) SC correlations[16,42–45] which are known to coexist with charge order above the bulk T_c.[46] This idea is substantiated by the fact that the temperature at which the T_1^{-1} upturn is suppressed seems to be limited to the bulk $T_c \sim 32$ K in zero field, implying that a magnetic field frustrates interlayer coupling but preserves intralayer coupling.[46]

While the slowing down of SFs above $T_{\rm SO}$ provides information regarding the charge order and its competing relationship with superconductivity, the complex field dependence that appears below $T_{\rm SO}$ *in the SC state* for both T_1^{-1} and β does not permit us to reach a conclusion about the relationship between spin and SC orders. Nevertheless, the saturated β below $T_{\rm SO}$ at 16 T suggests that spin order is further stabilized as superconductivity is weakened.

In conclusion, we reported ^{139}La T_1^{-1} measurements in $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ ($0.07 \leq x \leq 0.15$) and $La_{2-x}Ba_xCuO_4$ ($x = 1/8$). Our data suggest that charge ordering may trigger inhomogeneous slowing down of spin fluctuations toward spin stripe order. On the basis of our NMR results, we propose that charge ordering may set in at 70(10) K and compete with superconductivity in $La_{1.875}Sr_{0.125}CuO_4$.

We thank J. Geck for useful and delightful discussion. This work has been supported by the DFG through FOR 538 (Grants No. BU887/4 and No. ER342/1-3) and SPP1458 (Grant No. GR3330/2). S.B. acknowledges support by the DFG Research Grant No. BA 4927/1-1. M.H. acknowledges support by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), under Contract No. DE-AC02-98CH10886.

* sbaek.fu@gmail.com

[1] J. M. Tranquada, B. J. Sternlieb, J. D. Axe, Y. Nakamura, and S. Uchida, Nature **375**, 561 (1995).

[2] M. Fujita, H. Goka, K. Yamada, and M. Matsuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 167008 (2002).

[3] M. Hücker, G. Gu, J. Tranquada, M. Zimmermann, H.-H. Klauss, N. Curro, M. Braden, and B. Büchner, Physica C **460-462**, 170 (2007).

[4] J. Fink, E. Schierle, E. Weschke, J. Geck, D. Hawthorn, V. Soltwisch, H. Wadati, H.-H. Wu, H. A. Dürr, N. Wizent, et al., Phys. Rev. B **79**, 100502 (2009).

[5] J. Takeya, Y. Ando, S. Komiya, and X. F. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 077001 (2002).

[6] S. R. Park, A. Hamann, L. Pintschovius, D. Lamago, G. Khaliullin, M. Fujita, K. Yamada, G. D. Gu, J. M. Tranquada, and D. Reznik, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 214516 (2011).

[7] H.-H. Wu, M. Buchholz, C. Trabant, C. Chang, A. Komarek, F. Heigl, M. Zimmermann, M. Cwik, F. Nakamura, M. Braden, et al., Nat. Commun. **3**, 1023 (2012).

[8] S. V. Dordevic, S. Komiya, Y. Ando, and D. N. Basov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 167401 (2003).

[9] H. E. Mohottala, B. O. Wells, J. I. Budnick, W. A. Hines, C. Niedermayer, L. Udby, C. Bernhard, A. R. Moodenbaugh, and F.-C. Chou, Nat. Mater. **5**, 377 (2006).

[10] S. Katano, M. Sato, K. Yamada, T. Suzuki, and T. Fukase, Phys. Rev. B **62**, R14677 (2000).

[11] S. A. Kivelson, G. Aeppli, and V. J. Emery, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **98**, 11903 (2001).

[12] B. Lake, H. M. Ronnow, N. B. Christensen, G. Aeppli, K. Lefmann, D. F. McMorrow, P. Vorderwisch, P. Smeibidl, N. Mangkorntong, T. Sasagawa, et al., Nature **415**, 299 (2002).

[13] L. H. Machtoub, B. Keimer, and K. Yamada, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 107009 (2005).

[14] A. T. Savici, A. Fukaya, I. M. Gat-Malureanu, T. Ito, P. L. Russo, Y. J. Uemura, C. R. Wiebe, P. P. Kyriakou, G. J. MacDougall, M. T. Rovers, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 157001 (2005).

[15] J. Chang, C. Niedermayer, R. Gilardi, N. B. Christensen, H. M. Rønnow, D. F. McMorrow, M. Ay, J. Stahn, O. Sobolev, A. Hiess, et al., Phys. Rev. B **78**, 104525 (2008).

[16] A. A. Schafgans, A. D. LaForge, S. V. Dordevic, M. M. Qazilbash, W. J. Padilla, K. S. Burch, Z. Q. Li, S. Komiya, Y. Ando, and D. N. Basov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 157002 (2010).

[17] J. H. Cho, F. Borsa, D. C. Johnston, and D. R. Torgeson, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 3179 (1992).

[18] F. C. Chou, F. Borsa, J. H. Cho, D. C. Johnston, A. Lascialfari, D. R. Torgeson, and J. Ziolo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2323 (1993).

[19] V. Emery and S. Kivelson, Physica C **209**, 597 (1993).

[20] C. Niedermayer, C. Bernhard, T. Blasius, A. Golnik, A. Moodenbaugh, and J. I. Budnick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3843 (1998).

[21] M.-H. Julien, Physica B **329-333, Part 2**, 693 (2003).

[22] S. Sanna, G. Allodi, G. Concas, A. D. Hillier, and R. D. Renzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 207001 (2004).
[23] K. Ohishi, I. Yamada, A. Koda, W. Higemoto, S. R. Saha, R. Kadono, K. M. Kojima, M. Azuma, and M. Takano, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **74**, 2408 (2005).
[24] A. T. Savici, Y. Fudamoto, I. M. Gat, T. Ito, M. I. Larkin, Y. J. Uemura, G. M. Luke, K. M. Kojima, Y. S. Lee, M. A. Kastner, et al., Phys. Rev. B **66**, 014524 (2002).
[25] A. W. Hunt, P. M. Singer, A. F. Cederström, and T. Imai, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 134525 (2001).
[26] B. Simovič, P. C. Hammel, M. Hücker, B. Büchner, and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 012415 (2003).
[27] V. F. Mitrović, M.-H. Julien, C. de Vaulx, M. Horvatić, C. Berthier, T. Suzuki, and K. Yamada, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 014504 (2008).
[28] S.-H. Baek, P. C. Hammel, M. Hücker, B. Büchner, U. Ammerahl, A. Revcolevschi, and B. J. Suh, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 174505 (2013).
[29] S.-H. Baek, A. Erb, B. Büchner, and H.-J. Grafe, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 184508 (2012).
[30] G. Gu, M. Hücker, Y.-J. Kim, J. Tranquada, Q. Li, and A. Moodenbaugh, J. Cryst. Growth **287**, 318 (2006).
[31] T. Kimura, S. Miyasaka, H. Takagi, K. Tamasaku, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, K. Kitazawa, M. Hiroi, M. Sera, and N. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 8733 (1996).
[32] K. Kumagai, K. Kawano, I. Watanabe, K. Nishiyama, and K. Nagamine, Hyperfine Interact. **86**, 473 (1994).
[33] Y. Kohsaka, C. Taylor, K. Fujita, A. Schmidt, C. Lupien, T. Hanaguri, M. Azuma, M. Takano, H. Eisaki, H. Takagi, et al., Science **315**, 1380 (2007).
[34] N. Bloembergen, E. M. Purcell, and R. V. Pound, Phys. Rev. **73**, 679 (1948).
[35] B. J. Suh, P. C. Hammel, M. Hücker, B. Büchner, U. Ammerahl, and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. B **61**, R9265 (2000).
[36] N. J. Curro, P. C. Hammel, B. J. Suh, M. Hücker, B. Büchner, U. Ammerahl, and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 642 (2000).
[37] M. Hücker, M. v. Zimmermann, G. D. Gu, Z. J. Xu, J. S. Wen, G. Xu, H. J. Kang, A. Zheludev, and J. M. Tranquada, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 104506 (2011).
[38] M. Hücker, M. v. Zimmermann, Z. J. Xu, J. S. Wen, G. D. Gu, and J. M. Tranquada, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 014501 (2013).
[39] J. Chang, J. S. White, M. Laver, C. J. Bowell, S. P. Brown, A. T. Holmes, L. Maechler, S. Strässle, R. Gilardi, S. Gerber, et al., Phys. Rev. B **85**, 134520 (2012).
[40] E. Blackburn, J. Chang, M. Hücker, A. T. Holmes, N. B. Christensen, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, U. Rütt, O. Gutowski, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 137004 (2013).
[41] S. Blanco-Canosa, A. Frano, T. Loew, Y. Lu, J. Porras, G. Ghiringhelli, M. Minola, C. Mazzoli, L. Braicovich, E. Schierle, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 187001 (2013).
[42] Q. Li, M. Hücker, G. D. Gu, A. M. Tsvelik, and J. M. Tranquada, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 067001 (2007).
[43] J. Mosqueira, J. D. Dancausa, and F. Vidal, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 174518 (2011).
[44] L. S. Bilbro, R. V. Aguilar, G. Logvenov, O. Pelleg, I. Bozovic, and N. P. Armitage, Nat Phys **7**, 298 (2011).
[45] Z. Stegen, S. J. Han, J. Wu, A. K. Pramanik, M. Hücker, G. Gu, Q. Li, J. H. Park, G. S. Boebinger, and J. M. Tranquada, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 064509 (2013).
[46] E. Berg, E. Fradkin, S. A. Kivelson, and J. M. Tranquada, New J. Phys. **11**, 115004 (2009).
[47] The relatively sharp anomaly of T_1^{-1} near 180 K for $x = 0.15$ is due to the structural phase transition from the high temperature tetragonal (HTT) to the low temperature orthorhombic (LTO) phase.